

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Bill # SB 18 12/8/2008Short Title Utah Transparency Advisory Board AmendmentsContact Von Hortin Title Audit/Finance SpecialistAgency: State Office of Education Phone 801-538-7670**Short Form**

Use only when there is no appropriation needed for state agencies, and no fiscal impact on state revenues, local governments, businesses, or individuals.

If the bill looks like it should have a fiscal note, explain why it does not. For example, a bill might put into code something that is already current practice.

Attachments welcome.

- ☐ State agencies will not require an appropriation to implement the bill.
- ☐ There is no fiscal impact on local governments.
- ☐ There is no fiscal impact on businesses
- ☐ There is no fiscal impact on individuals.
- ☐ The bill will not affect revenues.

Explain why this bill has no fiscal impact.

A. What parts of the bill cause fiscal impact?

Cite specific sections or line numbers.

Lines 193 & 196 would require the districts to have and maintain a website with searchable data. If the requirement were to simply provide the data for use in the state website the costs would go down dramatically. Also if the data were better defined at this point a better cost estimate could be provided.

B. Which program gets the appropriation?

(Approp. Unit Code)

(To appropriate to an additional program use an additional form.) This is ____ of ____.

C. Work Notes: Assumptions, calculations & what are we buying?

Assume that a legislator calls you in to explain how you came up with your fiscal impact and these are the only notes you get to take with you.

List all costs. Identify one-time and ongoing costs. Detail FTE impacts.

Do not say, "\$50,000 in Current Expense." Be very specific about what \$50,000 will buy.

Attachments encouraged.

During the 2008 Session HB 113 proposed similar requirements. A last year USOE conducted a survey to determine the amount the school districts would need to invest to provide these services. In general, it would require additional personnel to be able to create the means of gathering the data, as well as ongoing personnel to maintain and update the required district websites. In a recent presentation John Reedhead, who now has just under a years experience in trying to implement the bill passed last year, reported that it has cost his department about \$500,0000 more than the appropriation for the bill just for development. There are additional costs for operating the transfers of data; they have not been added to the costs because they are believed to be minimal. The estimate assumes that data from the state's implementation would be shared with districts to reduce costs in development of their sites also. The results of the survey are on the tab in this document.

Fiscal Impact Tables

Current Budget Year
FY 2009

Coming Budget Year
FY 2010

Future Budget Year
FY 2011

D. If this is a revenue bill, show impacts here. (Select funds from drop-down menu.)

Total	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

E. Show Costs to Implement the Bill by Fund (Select funds from drop-down menu.)

Other	5,900,000	2,020,000	2,020,000
Total	<u>\$5,900,000</u>	<u>\$2,020,000</u>	<u>\$2,020,000</u>

F. Show Costs to Implement the Bill by Expense Category.

Personal Services	\$2,020,000	\$2,020,000	\$2,020,000
Travel			
Current Expense			
DP Current Expense	3,880,000		
DP Capital Outlay			
Capital Outlay			
Other/Pass Thru			
Total	<u>\$5,900,000</u>	<u>\$2,020,000</u>	<u>\$2,020,000</u>

G. How will the bill impact local governments?

Your estimate of the bill's impact on local governments.

Attachments welcome.

Local school districts would need to participate and provide data to the state as well as create their own websites with searchable data. Charter Schools would most likely be unaffected as the provisions on lines 211-213 would probably exempt most of them from any reporting--with the exception of American Leadership Academy.

H. How will the bill impact businesses?

Your estimate of the bill's impact on businesses.

Attachments welcome.

Because the work will be completed from locally generated funds, there would likely be an increase in local property taxes to be able to fund this requirement.

I. How will the bill impact individuals?

Your estimate of the bill's impact on individuals.

Attachments welcome.

Because the work will be completed from locally generated funds, there would likely be an increase in local property taxes to be able to fund these requirements.

This is a draft fiscal note response from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and may be revised in the future.

7/21/11 00:00

UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Schedule of 2009FL-0233/008 Costs
As estimated by individual School Districts

		One-Time	On-Going	Total
1	Alpine	\$ 115,336	\$ 37,951	\$ 153,287
2	Beaver	15,000	25,000	40,000
3	Box Elder	90,866	7,500	98,366
4	Cache	78,000	97,300	175,300
5	Carbon			-
6	Dagget			-
7	Davis	50,000	102,000	152,000
8	Duchesne	27,000	8,500	35,500
9	Emery			-
10	Garfield	30,000	68,000	98,000
11	Grand		6,900	6,900
12	Granite	13,617	20,010	33,627
13	Iron	3,712	80,038	83,750
14	Jordan	20,000	8,900	28,900
15	Juab			-
16	Kane			-
17	Millard	7,000	46,275	53,275
18	Morgan	15,000	25,000	40,000
19	Nebo	2,500	14,400	16,900
20	North Sanpete			-
21	North Summit			-
22	Park City			-
23	Piute			-
24	Rich			-
25	San Juan	25,000	50,850	75,850
26	Sevier	108,576	50,000	158,576
27	South Sanpete			-
28	South Summit	1,800	12,000	13,800
29	Tintic	-	3,000	3,000
30	Tooele			-
31	Uintah			-
32	Wasatch			-
33	Washington	1,500,000	600,000	2,100,000
34	Wayne			-
35	Weber	3,000	1,500	4,500
36	Salt Lake	50,000	65,000	115,000
37	Ogden			-
38	Provo	24,192	7,500	31,692
39	Logan			-
40	Murray			-
	USOE for FIS Districts	1,700,000	450,000	2,150,000
	Charters	23,200	232,000	255,200
	Total Districts	\$ 3,903,799	\$ 2,019,624	\$ 5,923,423

Please note many of the small districts without a cost are supported by the USOE FIS system and are included in the line just below Murray SD.